

CHAPTER V

The League of Nations

The constitution of the League of Nations is the Covenant which comprises the first twenty-six articles of the various peace treaties drawn at the Paris Conference at the close of the First World War.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Its Purposes. Its purposes were to promote international peace and security, persuade nations to accept obligations and not resort to war, engage in open and honest diplomacy, respect international law and all treaty obligations, and respect and honor the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Its Structure. The structure of the League consisted of an Assembly, a Council, and a Permanent Secretariat.

(a) **ASSEMBLY.** Each member state was entitled to three delegates, but only one vote. There were 58 member states when the Second World War broke out. The states not belonging to the League were the United States, Egypt, Nejd, Costa Rica, Brazil, Germany, and Japan. New members were admitted by a two-thirds vote of the Assembly. A member might resign after two years' notice, provided it had properly fulfilled its obligations. Brazil and Costa Rica had done so. Japan in 1932 and Germany in 1933 resigned precipitously. Sessions were held annually at Geneva, on the second Monday in September. Its officials were a president, six vice-presidents, six standing committees, and many auxiliary committees, that dealt with constitutional questions, technical organizations, armaments, budget and administration, social problems, and political questions.

The Assembly's functions were to (1) confer, advise, and deliberate but not to legislate, (2) make the budget for the League, (3) select nonpermanent members of the Council, (4) admit states into League membership, (5) help elect the judges of the Permanent Court of International Justice, and (6) advise the reconsideration of treaties which might have become inapplicable.

(b) **COUNCIL.** It was composed of one delegate from each of fifteen states entitled to representation. There were in 1939

four permanent members—France, Soviet Russia, Great Britain, and Italy—and eleven nonpermanent members. Italy's resignation from the League went into effect November, 1939. The nonpermanent positions had three year terms of office, and three members retired each year. Its meetings were held in Geneva three times per year—in January, May, and September. The presidency rotated in successive sessions among the delegates in the alphabetical order of the names of the member states in French. Except in matters of procedure decisions of the Council were made by unanimous vote. When a nonmember of the Council was concerned in a problem, that state was entitled to a temporary seat in the Council.

Its functions were to (1) formulate plans for the reduction of armaments, (2) advise on the means of protecting member states in time of foreign aggression, (3) mediate in case of international disputes, (4) receive reports from mandatory powers, and (5) recommend to the member states what each is to do to protect the covenants of the League.

(c) **PERMANENT SECRETARIAT.** It comprised a secretary-general and a large staff. The former received his post from the Council with the approval of a majority of the Assembly. The secretary-general, in turn, selected his staff of about 500 men and women with the consent of the Council.

The Secretariat's functions were to (1) collect data and, to do so, it was divided into eleven sections dealing with the problems of politics, information, law, economics and finance, transit, administrative commissions and minorities questions, mandates, disarmament, health, social problems, and international associations; (2) register treaties, of which there are over 2,000; and (3) serve as secretaries to the Council and to the Assembly.

(d) **SUPPLEMENTARY ORGANIZATIONS.** Some of these were: (1) technical organizations, e.g., the Economic and Financial Organization, the Organization on Communications and Transit, and the Health Organization; and (2) advisory committees, e.g., the Committee on Mandates, Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, and the International Hydrographic Bureau at Monaco.

THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The International Labor Organization was an integral part of the League, but it was autonomous. It owed its existence to Article XXIII of the Covenant, which stipulated that the interests of labor were to be protected. Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles narrated the objectives of the international labor movement, which had

been realized in many of the civilized countries of the world. They included the right to organize, an eight hour day, the abolition of child labor, and the like.

Organization. Its organization, similar to that of the League, consisted of a General Conference, a Governing Body, and an International Labor Office. Workers and employers were represented.

Functions. It made recommendations and drafted conventions for the improvement of labor conditions, which the member nations were obliged to submit for consideration to their respective national legislatures. Over 50 such recommendations were made, dealing with woman and child labor, night work, unemployment, public labor exchanges, and the like, with little effect in the industrial countries of the West, but with some success in India, Persia, Japan, and China.

On January 28, 1935, the United States joined this organization, although she continued to refuse to join the League of Nations or the World Court.

THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE, OR THE WORLD COURT

Organization. The Permanent Court of International Justice, or the World Court, is provided for by Article XIV of the League Covenant, but was created by a separate protocol. It was thus possible to be a member of the World Court and not of the League. Its organization provided for a court of 15 judges for a term of 9 years, elected by absolute majorities of the Council and the Assembly, to sit in session all year at The Hague.

Authority. The jurisdiction of the court was (1) voluntary, when the two or more countries voluntarily submitted their quarrel for adjudication; (2) compulsory, only in those instances in which the nations had signed the *Optional Clause to the Protocol of the Court* giving the Court absolute jurisdiction in all legal disputes dealing with international relations; or (3) advisory, when the Council or the Assembly requested legal advice.

Its History. By the eve of the Second World War only 41 nations including England, Germany, and Italy, had signed the *Optional Clause* giving the Court compulsory jurisdiction over them. Statesmen were in doubt as to whether advisory opinions were valid, whether the Council had to vote unanimously to ask for an advisory opinion, and whether it was wise to request such an opinion, since it might be colored by international politics rather than by justice. About 20 or more decisions and an equal number

of advisory opinions were handed down by the Court. There were 19 more members over which the Court primarily had voluntary jurisdiction in 1939, thus making a total membership of 60.

The Hague Court and the World Court. The Hague Court must not be confused with the World Court. The Hague Court was a court of arbitration. Its arbitrators were selected by the disputing nations from a list of 132 distinguished jurists. The World Court, on the other hand, was a court of law and not of arbitration, and rendered decisions based on international law.

THE LEAGUE AND THE PRESERVATION OF PEACE

The articles of the League Covenant that treat with the problem of the preservation of peace are:

Article X. It states that the member states agree "to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League."

Article XI. Herein, member nations concede it "to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends."

Article XII. It states that in no case will the parties resort to war until three months after the award.

Article XIII. It stipulates that member nations agree to submit to arbitration or judicial settlement any dispute suitable for such treatment and to carry out in good faith any decision which may be rendered.

Article XV. It provides that the member nations agree to submit to the Council any dispute likely to lead to war which is not submitted to an arbitral or judicial tribunal. Decisions to be binding must be decided by a unanimous vote of the Council, interested parties excluded.

It recites that the Council may submit the dispute to the Assembly for decision. To be conclusive, the decision must be supported by a unanimous vote of the delegates of all those nations that have seats in the Council and a majority vote of the remaining members of the League. The League, however, shall have no jurisdiction in disputes within a nation.

Article XVI. Should a nation go to war without first resorting to arbitration or the World Court, all the other members, upon

the authority of this article, agree "immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations." Should the economic boycott fail, the Council may recommend to the member nations what armaments they are to contribute to punish the recalcitrant nation. Such decisions of the Council require a unanimous vote, excluding interested parties.

Article XVI has never been employed, though occasions have arisen when it might have been used effectively.

POLITICAL DISPUTES

More than thirty political disputes which grew out of the war were adjusted by the League Council, and less frequently by the Assembly, the Council of Ambassadors, or the Permanent Court of International Justice. Thus, the efficacy of the League of Nations and its agencies was established. Not always were these adjustments satisfactory and permanent, however.

The Aaland Islands Dispute. These islands are located at the mouth of the Gulf of Bothnia between Sweden and Finland. The islands belonged to Finland, but the inhabitants desired to be annexed to Sweden. Under Article XI of the Covenant, Great Britain brought the controversy to the attention of the League Council in July, 1920. Finland contended that the controversy was a domestic matter and that Sweden recognized the independence of Finland, including the Aaland Islands. Sweden countered that the islanders expressed Swedish nationalism and therefore she proposed a plebiscite. Upon the advice of a legal committee and an investigating committee, the League Council decided on June 24, 1931, that Finland was to retain the sovereignty over the islands, to the inhabitants of which she had to grant autonomy, however. Besides, the islands were to be neutralized and unfortified.

Vilna Controversy. The dispute between Lithuania and Poland over Vilna was not as successfully settled by the League. Vilna originally was the capital of Lithuania. In the 14th century Lithuania and Poland were united by the marriage of their respective rulers and Vilna rapidly became Polonized. By the partitions of Poland in the 18th century, Vilna passed under Russian rule and remained so until the First World War. After the war, Lithuania and Poland set up their independent governments at Vilna and Warsaw, respectively. The boundary between Lithuania and Poland was to be fixed by the League. Because of the turbulent conditions brought about by the war with the Bolsheviks, the Allied Supreme Council laid down the temporary Curzon Line, which awarded Vilna to Lithuania. Later the contending nations at the Treaty of Moscow on July 12, 1920, agreed that Vilna should belong to Lithu-

ania. But the Bolsheviks overran this territory and captured Vilna. The Lithuanians and the Poles united to drive out the invaders only to have Vilna fall into possession of Poland, who now refused to relinquish it to the Lithuanians. The League Council succeeded in getting the countries to arbitrate the controversy, with the result that Vilna was awarded to Lithuania. But the Polish General Zeligowski defied this agreement and took possession of Vilna on October 10, 1920. The League Council, in despair, at first recommended a plebiscite, and then direct negotiations between the countries, but in vain. On February 3, 1923, the League Council assigned to Poland all the land occupied by General Zeligowski including Vilna, and on February 15, 1923, the Council of Ambassadors ratified this decision. Lithuania protested against this disposition of the quarrel and made futile efforts to reopen the question. Taking advantage of the European crisis caused by Germany invading Austria, Poland, in March, 1938, exacted an acceptance of the *status quo* by Lithuania and the rest of Europe.

The Memel Dispute. The seaport of Memel up to the close of the First World War belonged to Germany, but was, then, surrendered by her to the Allies. An Allied high commissioner supported by French troops governed it temporarily. Opinion was divided as to the disposition of the city. Some wanted to surrender it to Lithuania, others to Poland, and still others wished to make it a free city like Danzig. Fearful that she might lose Memel, Lithuania took possession of it. The League Council enlisted the services of Norman H. Davis and a commission to solve the problem. On March 15, 1924, the League Council and Lithuania accepted its report. It provided that Lithuania have full sovereignty over Memel, that Memel have considerable autonomy, and that an International Harbor Board, composed of a Lithuanian, a Pole, and a citizen of Memel, administer the port. German Nazi agitation to annex Memel caused Lithuania to employ oppressive measures. These tactics outraged the Germanized majority of the inhabitants and the German government. In the elections of September, 1935, the Germans won control of the Memel chamber of deputies. A directorate controlled by Germans was organized under a German Nazi president. Thus the government fell into the hands of the German Nazis.

The Upper Silesian Dispute. The Peace Treaty provided that a plebiscite was to be conducted by an Inter-Allied commission to settle the controversy between Germany and Poland over Upper Silesia. The vote disclosed 754 German and 699 Polish communes. Germany contended that Upper Silesia was economically indivisible, while Poland wanted those communes that had Polish major-

ities. But neither the Inter-Allied Commission, consisting of French, British, and Italian members, nor the Supreme Council could agree upon a solution. The League Council took the matter in hand and partitioned Upper Silesia, giving the larger part of the population and territory to Germany, but ceding the greater portion of the economic resources, consisting of coal, zinc, and lead mines, zinc and lead foundries, and steel mills to Poland. It also recommended an Upper Silesian Mixed Commission, consisting of two Germans, two Poles, and a resident of another country, to supervise the entire area as an economic and social unit for fifteen years. On October 20, 1921, the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers adopted these recommendations.

The Albanian Dispute. The strategic position of Albania on the Adriatic Sea made Yugoslavia, Greece, and Italy solicitous of it. The Council of Ambassadors was ordered to delimit the boundaries of Albania. Yugoslavia had taken Albania and was in possession of it at the time. When the League Council threatened Yugoslavia with an economic blockade, she immediately effected a conciliation with the Council of Ambassadors. The old boundaries of Albania at the close of the Balkan Wars were practically restored on November 9, 1921, except that the boundary between Albania and Yugoslavia was demilitarized.

The Mosul Boundary Dispute. The Treaty of Lausanne (1923) stipulated that Turkey and Great Britain were to decide upon the boundary separating Turkey from Iraq (Mesopotamia), which was a British mandate. Should they fail to agree on a boundary, the League Council was to determine it. The bone of contention between the two countries was the vilayet of Mosul, rich in petroleum. The matter, therefore, had to be submitted to the League Council for adjudication. The "Brussels Line" was the temporary line agreed upon in October, 1924, until a permanent frontier could be established. It left Mosul under British control. In the meantime, the League Council secured an advisory opinion from the World Court, which declared that the decision of the League Council would be binding on both parties in the controversy, provided its decision be unanimous, exclusive of interested countries. The findings of the League's commission ultimately were that the majority of the people south of the "Brussels Line," namely the vilayet of Mosul, favored Turkey but that their economic interests would be enhanced by a union with Iraq governed as a British mandate for a period of 25 years, provided due consideration were shown to the Kurds in the disputed area. The Turks wanted the vilayet of Mosul because it had not been conquered by the British during the war, and was inhabited by Turkish sympathizers. The British contended

that it was a necessary source of Iraq's grain supply and served as a natural boundary. All these arguments were overshadowed by the fact that Mosul is rich in petroleum. The commission's recommendations were accepted by the League Council on March 11, 1926. However, in June, 1926, by an Anglo-Turkish treaty, a small section of the vilayet of Mosul was returned to Turkey, and some royalties were granted her on the Mosul oil.

The Greco-Italian Dispute. The Delimitation Commission, consisting of four Italians and one Albanian, created by the Council of Ambassadors to locate the boundary between Albania and Greece, was killed on Greek soil in 1923. Italy at once presented an ultimatum to Greece demanding 50,000,000 lire as indemnity and an inquiry with the assistance of an Italian military attaché. Greece declined, since such procedure would violate her sovereign rights. When Italy occupied the Greek island of Corfu at the mouth of the Adriatic Sea, Greece appealed to the League for justice. Mussolini, at first, contended that the League had no jurisdiction in the matter, but then argued juristically that it was a matter for the Delimitation Commission and the Council of Ambassadors to settle. The Council decided that a Greek commission, supervised by an Inter-Allied one, should conduct an inquiry; the Greek judicial proceedings be supervised by representatives of the League; and the 50,000,000 lire be deposited in a Swiss Bank, out of which indemnity to Italy was to be paid, if the findings of the Greek commission were satisfactory to the Council of Ambassadors. The investigating commission reported that the guilty people could not be found, whereupon the Council of Ambassadors ordered Greece to pay Italy, 50,000,000 lire and apologize to her. Corfu, however, was evacuated by Italy on September 27, 1923.

The Greco-Bulgarian Dispute. On October 19, 1925, Greek sentinels along the Greco-Bulgarian border were shot. This provoked a Greek invasion of Bulgaria, and Bulgaria appealed to the Secretary-General of the League for justice. The League Council ordered them to cease warfare immediately and to withdraw troops from one another's territory—an order with which they complied. A commission then concluded that there were no premeditated plans of attack on either side, that the invasion by the Greeks of Bulgarian soil was unjustified, and that Greece must pay an indemnity of \$220,000 to Bulgaria by March 1, 1926.

The Chaco Dispute. Bolivia and Paraguay quarreled for eight years over the possession of the Chaco district. Bolivia claimed it by virtue of old Spanish land grants and a treaty with Paraguay. Furthermore, she felt she must have access to the sea or else stifle economically. Paraguay, too, claimed it by virtue of an

old Spanish land grant. The mediation in December, 1928, by the existing Pan-American Conference on Arbitration and Conciliation was rejected by Bolivia. The League Council reminded both countries of their obligations under the Covenant of the League, whereupon they yielded to the invitation of the Pan-American Conference to arbitrate. The good offices of both organizations were in vain, since the two countries continued their bloody warfare in spite of them in direct violation of their obligations under the Covenant of the League. The efforts made by the Commission of Neutrals and the ABCP group of Latin American states were also in vain. On March 6, 1934, both Bolivia and Paraguay rejected the plan of peace recommended by the League of Nations Commission on the Chaco. It proposed to allow the Permanent Court of International Justice to decide the question. On May 12, 1934, the League's Chaco Commission, under Alvarez del Vayo, startled world public opinion by a frank disclosure that the munitions manufacturers of the United States and European countries, in their lust for profits, were responsible for prolonging the Chaco War. It urged a complete embargo on arms shipments to the belligerents. About 34 of the countries, including the United States, accepted the principle of the embargo. It boded well for peace in the Chaco, but the intent was nullified by the munitions manufacturers, who sold their wares in unprohibited countries, where they were resold to the belligerents. Paraguay, with its small but literate white population, had defeated the ignorant, peon, Indian soldiers of Bolivia and was in possession of the Chaco with its oil fields, when she consented to a truce in June, 1935. The United States, Brazil, Argentina, Peru, and Chile are to be congratulated for this success. Peace was assured. In February, 1938, Argentina gave landlocked Bolivia an outlet for her oil through her own country. Had Argentina permitted this eight years earlier there would not have been the Chaco War. Bolivia finally yielded by cancelling the concessions to the Standard Oil Company and turning them over to the Argentine, Paraguayan, and British interests.

The Letician Dispute. Leticia is located at the intersection of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Brazil. The only method of egress for its inhabitants is by a 2,000 mile journey down the long navigable Amazon River. Colombia and Peru waged a bloody war over the possession of this none too valuable tract of land. But unlike the Chaco disputants, the two controverting Latin American countries ultimately decided to settle the dispute by arbitration. On June 23, 1933, a League Commission, pending its recommended settlement of the dispute, was entrusted for one year with the task of governing and policing the area. The commission consisted of a Cuban, a Brazilian, a Spaniard, and Colonel Arthur Brown of the

United States, who was chairman. A resumption of the war between Peru and Colombia seemed imminent as the life of the Commission was about to expire without having found a satisfactory solution of the problem. However, two days before its expiration, another useless war in South America was averted, when a treaty between Peru and Colombia was concluded providing for an expression of regret by Peru for her seizure of Leticia on September 1, 1932, the demilitarization of Leticia, the governing of it by Colombia, the free navigation of the Amazon River, and the solution of future controversies by a commission and, for appeals, The Hague Tribunal.

The settlement of the Letician controversy is significant because in the case of both the League Commission, which assumed direct control of a territory, and the League, which was the arbitrator in an international dispute in the Western Hemisphere rather than the United States, it was the first instance of such action.

The Manchurian Dispute. Because of repeated attacks by Chinese on the South Manchurian Railway, the Japanese on September 18, 1931, seized Mukden, the capital of Manchuria, and extended their control over all of Manchuria and later of Jehol. Japan contended that the lawlessness and banditry in China were in contravention of the *Twenty-One Demands* submitted to her in 1915. This necessitated intervention to maintain peace and order, and to destroy the boycott which the Chinese had organized. Japan protested that she was not declaring war on China or conquering her territory, and hence was not violating the Covenant of the League of Nations; the Kellogg Peace Pact, or the Nine Power Treaty. China was no match either as a military or naval power for Japan. She, therefore, resorted to guerrilla warfare and the economic boycott. Japan took no heed at first of the League Council's request to arbitrate and soon the alleged independent state of Manchukuo was established with Pu Yi, the former ruler of China, as emperor.

In December, 1931, the Lytton Commission of Inquiry, consisting of the Earl of Lytton and one representative each from France, Italy, Germany, and the United States, was appointed to investigate the controversy between China and Japan with a view toward reconciliation. The Lytton Report, which was submitted on October 2, 1932, recommended direct negotiations between China and Japan under international auspices, international co-operation in the internal reorganization of China, and the restoration of Manchukuo to Chinese sovereignty as an autonomous state with adequate protection of Japanese interests. It also declared that Japan had exceeded her privileges of self-defense in China, and had created Manchukuo to further her imperialistic ambitions in China and not necessarily to grant nationalism to the inhabitants of the state.

The Assembly accepted the Lytton Report, but China and Japan were displeased with it; China, because it did not provide for the immediate Japanese evacuation of Chinese territory; and Japan, because she considered Manchukuo a *fait accompli*. The great powers of the world appeared reluctant to press Japan further. Since the collapse of the League, which proved utterly impotent in this emergency, was feared, the Lytton Report was submitted to a Committee of Nineteen for further study and investigation. In the meantime, Japan demonstrated her determination by quitting the League in 1932 and extending her rule into the area south of the Chinese Great Wall in 1938.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The success of the League in coping with the difficult political disputes of Europe and Asia was not marked. One feels that it showed no more success in handling economic crises.

Austrian Economic Distress. The landlocked Austrian republic came into being financially exhausted and depleted of much of her former population, land, resources, and wealth. The Allied powers, recognizing her plight, came to her assistance by giving her food and supplies on credit, relief loans of \$48,000,000 made by Great Britain, France, and Italy in 1919, loans of \$24,000,000 made by the United States between 1919 and 1921, relief credits of \$100,000,000 granted by Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Switzerland during the years 1919 to 1921, and charity amounting to \$50,000,000. These credits did not solve Austria's economic problem, but merely alleviated the misery. She was on the brink of revolution in 1922, but this was avoided when France, Great Britain, Italy, and Czechoslovakia extended additional financial assistance to her.

But Austria was still in distress, for her krone was worth only one fifteen-thousandth of its par value; a social upheaval was still imminent; and taxation was overwhelming. The Austrian Chancellor Seipel was even willing to arrange a customs union with Italy, Germany, or Czechoslovakia, were it not for the fear of serious diplomatic complications. The League Council took the matter in hand and on October 4, 1922, the Austrian Committee had its proposals adopted: (1) Austria's political and economic integrity was to be guaranteed, provided she did not compromise it by economic or political alliances, (2) Austrian taxes were to be increased and expenditures minimized, (3) Great Britain, France, Italy, and Czechoslovakia were to guarantee a loan up to \$135,000,000, of which one-fifth was to cover the advance made during 1922, (4) a bank of issue was to be established to control Austrian

loans and issuance of paper money, and (5) a commissioner-general, Dr. Alfred Zimmerman, with the Committee of Control of the guaranteeing government was to supervise the plan and report to the League Council. On June 9, 1926, the League ceased to supervise the finances of Austria because of the apparent economic rehabilitation of the country. However, the economic recovery was only temporary. Other factors led to the political and economic collapse of Austria, which terminated in the dictatorships of Chancellors Engelburt Dollfuss and Kurt Schuschnigg.

Hungarian Economic Distress. Though the economic distress was not as great as in Austria, Hungary solicited League intervention to prevent economic collapse. The League Council appointed a Hungarian Committee, composed of members from Great Britain, France, Italy, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, to solve the problem. Its recommendations, adopted on May 1, 1924, advised that Jeremiah Smith, Jr., of Boston, be appointed commissioner-general with responsibility to the League; an independent bank enjoying a monopoly of note issue be established; a reconstruction loan of 250,000,000 gold crowns, secured by specific Hungarian revenues, be floated in the United States, Holland, Switzerland, Sweden, Italy, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary; and the crown be stabilized and the budget balanced. Since the plan was unusually successful, on June 10, 1926, the League abolished the office of the commissioner-general and ceased to supervise Hungary. As in Austria, the economic recovery of Hungary was short-lived.

Greek Economic Distress. After the Greco-Turkish War in 1922, Greece found it impossible to absorb nearly 1,500,000 refugees without additional finances. With the aid of a League commission, a foreign loan of \$50,000,000 was successfully floated in 1924 to finance the refugees on land provided by the Greek government. By 1928 thousands of families were rehabilitated, and agriculture and industry in Greece prospered. In 1928, another loan under the auspices of the League was floated, a new bank of issue was established, and the national budget was balanced.

Bulgarian, Esthonian, and Danzig Financial Distress. Between 1926 and 1928, 30,000 Bulgarian refugees were aided in the buying of lands, homes, agricultural implements, and domestic animals by Bulgarian government loans, granted by the Allies under the auspices of the League. Financial assistance was furnished both to the Esthonian government so that it might be put on the gold basis, and to the Free City of Danzig to develop its harbor facilities.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE WORK OF THE LEAGUE

In addition to its authority in settling political disputes, and assisting countries in economic distress, administrative and supervisory powers, such as have to do with (1) the Saar Basin, (2) the Free City of Danzig, (3) the mandatory system, and (4) the protection of minorities, were vested in the League.

The Saar Basin. In accordance with the Treaty of Versailles, a Governing Commission of the Saar Basin, consisting of five members—one citizen of France, one inhabitant of the Saar territory, and three citizens of foreign countries other than France or Germany—was appointed by the League Council. In addition, an Advisory Council was elected by the inhabitants of the Saar Basin. M. Rault was made president of the Governing Commission, which soon became a tool of the French foreign policy. The Saar Basin press was muzzled; complaints of the Advisory Council were inadequately presented to the League Council; French currency was established; the Saar Basin was included in the French customs union; German children were persuaded to attend French schools; French mines were insufficiently taxed; and Saar miners went on strike for better conditions of labor.

Finally, in July, 1923, Great Britain requested the League to investigate. The League Council aired the abuses and recommended the withdrawal of the French troops. In 1926 the resignation of Rault and the appointment of a German to the League Council made for a more honorable treatment of the Saar Basin inhabitants. The ultimate solution of the problem of government in the Saar Basin remained to be determined by the plebiscite in 1935. On January 15 it was decided that the Saar Basin be annexed to Germany by the overwhelming plebiscite vote of 90%. The large German sympathizing population in the Saar and the effective German Nazi propaganda were responsible for this result.

The nations of the world were fearful that the Saar plebiscite election would precipitate a war between France and Germany. To avert this, the League of Nations' Special Commission, with the consent of France and Germany, decided, in advance of the elections on December 3, 1934, that, should the plebiscite go in favor of Germany: (1) France would accept 900,000,000 francs as settlement for the mines and all other French wealth in the Saar, with 11,000,000 tons of coal during the next 5 years as part payment; (2) Germany would extend to the nonvoting population of the Saar the same guarantees promised by the League to nonvoting minority populations; would respect Saarlanders' acquired rights as to social insurance and state aid; and would not persecute any of the inhabitants for at least one year; and (3) the League would

preserve order in the Saar at the time of the elections with an international police force of British, Italian, Swedish, and Netherland soldiers.

Danzig and the Polish Corridor. The Peace Conference had decreed that the German city of Danzig should be established as a free city under the auspices of the League. The inhabitants drafted the constitution of the Free City of Danzig on November 15, 1920, which was ratified by the League in May, 1922. Poland controlled its diplomatic and its industrial life, but the inhabitants had a degree of autonomy. They had their own bicameral legislature, but the executive was a high commissioner appointed by the League. Though he served as chief justice also, appeals might be made from his decisions to the League Council and even to the World Court. The port of Danzig was controlled by a commission, consisting of an equal number of Poles and Danzigers and a neutral chairman. Poland was assured of the free use of the port and of free trade between Poland and the Free City of Danzig.

The relations between Danzig and Poland were not harmonious because of the incompatibility of the Germans and the Poles, and of their economic and political differences. The Free City's export and import trade had greatly increased in recent years and the League's loan of \$7,500,000 had improved its accommodations for shipping. The strong movement under way among German Danzigers to have the Free City annexed to the Reich was applauded by the Hitlerites and other German nationalists, but was opposed by Poland and her financial and diplomatic champion, France. Another matter that occasioned considerable grievance was Poland's construction of another seaport, Gdynia, near Danzig, so that it might deflect shipping from the port of Danzig to itself and thus enable Polish commerce to avoid League supervision. In September, 1933, negotiations were concluded between the Free City and Warsaw, providing that Poland direct 45% of her entire annual imports and exports through the port of Danzig and 55% through the port of Gdynia. A mixed Polish and Danzig committee supervised the execution of this agreement. Thus ended the long controversy between Danzig and Gdynia in the League Council.

This did not prevent Germany from trying to establish a Nazi régime in Danzig. At the eve of the elections of April 7, 1935, the Nazi party controlled a simple majority in both houses of the Danzig legislature. Besides, the president of the upper house was a Nazi. In the elections, the Nazis failed by only 5 seats to secure the necessary two-thirds majority in both houses to be able to amend the constitution of the Free City of Danzig to establish a miniature Nazi government. However, by a *coup d'état* in 1937 they succeeded.

The Polish Corridor was the neck of land about 250 miles long and about 80 miles wide which connected Poland with Danzig, but incidentally severed East Prussia from the rest of Germany. Without it Poland was landlocked and doomed to economic deterioration. In April, 1921, free transportation of German goods across the Corridor was arranged for between Poland and Germany. The oppression of the German minority in the Corridor in the process of Polonization was the cause of much controversy between Germany and Poland. At Locarno, in 1925, Germany refused to agree to permanent acceptance of her current Polish borders. Later Nazi Germany became even less conciliatory concerning her eastern borders. However, the Hitlerites accepted the *status quo* for a period of ten years in a treaty with Poland (January, 1934), in consideration of an assurance that Poland would not attack Germany in the event the latter was engaged in war. In violation of this treaty, Germany took military possession of Danzig in the closing days of August, 1939, when Poland refused to permit Germany to build a rail and automobile road through the Polish Corridor connecting Danzig with Germany. This event constituted the immediate cause of the Second World War.

MANDATES

Definition. The Peace Conference created the mandates to provide a system of enlightened government for the surrendered possessions of Germany and Turkey. The mandatory countries were those states selected by the League to administer these mandates in the interests of the inhabitants.

League Supervision. Annually the mandatory power reported to the League regarding its mandates. The Permanent Mandates Commission, consisting of eleven independent experts, the majority of whom were citizens of non-mandatory countries, presented its advisory findings to the League Council. Each year both the Council and the Assembly openly discussed the welfare of the mandates, thus demonstrating a more responsible spirit in world politics.

(a) **SYRIA.** In 1926 the Permanent Mandates Commission rebuked France for her maladministration of Syria, whereupon France liberalized the treatment of the Syrians but her rule remained severe until the outbreak of the Second World War. After the Second World War independence was granted.

(b) **PALESTINE.** In 1930 the Mandates Commission, at the request of Great Britain, investigating the quarrel over the *Wailing Wall* between the Jews and the Mohammedans, found that the British government had failed, because it had not clarified the regula-

tions concerning the Wall. England's proposal of 1937 to solve the quarrel between the Arabs and the Jews for the possession of Palestine by dividing it into three parts, with England retaining the central one which includes Jerusalem, has thus far proven unacceptable to both Arabs and Jews.

England's difficulties in Palestine lay in the fact that she promised the Holy Land to both the Arabs and the Jews as guarantees of their loyalty during the First World War. Her inability to fulfill both promises has made her administration most embarrassing, particularly since she herself refuses to relinquish her hold there because of the country's strategic position in the Mediterranean Sea.

(c) IRAQ. After England relinquished her mandatory authority over Iraq, she requested that Iraq be allowed to enter the League. This application was granted in October, 1932. The beneficence of England is questioned in this matter because Iraq later became a protectorate of England. This enabled England to exploit the oil wells of Iraq without any interference of the League. In September, 1933, some of the Iraqi massacred hundreds of Christian Assyrians, an act which caused statesmen to believe that the declaration of the independence of Iraq might have been premature.

The Classification of the Mandates. The mandates were divided into three categories, A, B, and C, in accordance with their location, economic status, and cultural development.

(a) CLASS A MANDATES. These were lands which had reached such a high stage of development that they might be recognized as independent nations, but needed administrative advice until they could exist unaided. The former Turkish lands were in this category.

CLASS A MANDATES

Mandate	Mandatory Power
Syria	France
Lebanon	France
Palestine	Great Britain
Transjordan	Great Britain
Iraq (independent in 1932)	Great Britain

(b) CLASS B MANDATES. Those which were less advanced were cared for by the mandatory powers with a greater amount of supervision and with definite guarantees to the League for the welfare of the inhabitants. They were formerly owned by Germany.

CLASS B MANDATES

Mandate	Mandatory Power
Cameroon (one-sixth)	Great Britain
East Africa (Tanganyika)	Great Britain
Togoland (one-third)	Great Britain
Cameroon (five-sixths)	France
Togoland (two-thirds)	France
Ruanda-Urundi	Belgium

(c) **CLASS C MANDATES.** The Class C Mandates included Southwest Africa and the Pacific Islands, both of which had belonged to Germany. Because of their sparseness of population, their small size, and their remoteness from centers of civilization, they were assigned to neighboring mandatory powers and were governed as integral portions of their own empires, subject to certain safeguards for the natives.

CLASS C MANDATES

Mandate	Mandatory Power
Southwest Africa	Union of South Africa
Western Samoa	New Zealand
Nauru	Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand
Former German Pacific Islands south of the Equator	Australia
Former German Pacific Islands north of the Equator	Japan

MINORITIES

Difficulties with Minority Guarantees. About 30,000,000 people were scattered throughout eastern and western Europe as national minorities because of the inability or unwillingness of the statesmen at the Peace Conference to make national and state boundaries coincide. Most of these people lived under the League's guardianship, which was assured them by the special minority treaties, or the minority provisions of the Peace Treaties. In most instances, violations of minority rights might have been referred to the League Council. In 1921 the World Court held that it had no jurisdiction to deal with the Finno-Russian dispute over the Finnish minority in Eastern Karelia, because the Finno-Russian minority treaty was only a bilateral agreement. The problem of correcting these abuses was a trying one, since the task invariably involved an alleged violation of the state's sovereign rights.

(a) **MINORITIES COMMITTEE.** In 1929 the League Council revised its methods of dealing with minorities. A Minorities Committee was created, consisting of the president of the League Council and two colleagues selected by him, to decide whether the petitions to remedy designated abuses against minorities were worthy of consideration by the League Council. All communications were conducted through the Minorities Section of the Secretariat, which also collected all the necessary data on the problem for the League Council. The latter made it a practice not to dictate arbitrary solutions of these problems, but to direct conciliations and compromises. Since few of these disputes could really yield to compromise, few were satisfactorily settled in this way. Among the more notorious

violations of the minorities guarantees were those of the legal rights of the Germans in the Polish Corridor, the Jews in Rumania, and the Jews in Upper Silesia of Germany. Little was actually accomplished, but it must be admitted that these guarantees restrained the dominant nations from being too severe with their minorities. In October, 1934, Poland threatened to abrogate her minorities treaty, but under League pressure she soon retracted her threat. The most flagrant violation of minority rights up to 1939 was that of the Jews in Nazi Germany and Austria, though many of these Jews considered themselves German and Austrian citizens and not minorities. At any rate, all protests against their inhuman treatment had proven almost futile.

MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES OF THE LEAGUE

1. The Health Section of the Secretariat.
2. The Committee of Intellectual Co-operation.
3. The International Institute for the Unification of Private Law.
4. The International Educational Cinematographic Institute.

DISSOLUTION OF THE LEAGUE, 1946

The League was not uniformly successful in settling all political disputes and in reducing armaments, but it did further international co-operation in many ways, in the extension of intellectual relations, the drafting of health regulations, the suppression of traffic in women, the restriction of the sale of opium, the codification of international law, and so forth.

The causes of the failure of the League lay in the survival of power diplomacy, the absence of a European policy of peaceful reconstruction, an unwillingness to disarm, and the failure to make changes in the Peace Treaties as conditions required.

Throughout the Second World War a skeleton organization continued to function at Geneva. The International Labor Office moved to Montreal, Canada; the Economic and Financial Organization to Princeton, New Jersey; and several national subcommittees continued to operate in their respective capitals. Officially the League did not disband until April, 1946, when the Assembly of the United Nations was ready to begin a new program for international co-operation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, D., *The Fight for Peace*.
Bassett, J. S., *The League of Nations*.
Beales, A. C., *The History of Peace*.
Eagleton, C., *International Organization*.
Hudson, M. O., *The World Court*.
Industry, Governments and Labor, Record of the International Labor Organization 1919-1928, World Peace Foundation Pamphlet, 1928.
Janowski, O., *Jews and Minority Rights*.
Kelchner, W. H., *Latin American Relations with the League of Nations*.
League of Nations, Various publications.
Lindsey, E., *International Court*.
Lowe, B. E., *International Protection of Labor*.
Margalith, A. M., *International Mandates*.
Morley, F., *Society of Nations*.
Perigord, P., *International Labor Organization*.
Revusky, A., *Jews in Palestine*.
Stephens, J. S., *Danger Zones of Europe*.
Wendelm, E. C., *Subject Index to the Economic and Financial Documents of the League of Nations*.

SELECTED TEXTBOOK REFERENCES

- Benns, Chap. VI; Chambers, Chap. VII; Haines, Chaps. IV, V; Hall, Chap. IV; Langsam, Chap. VI; Slosson, Chap. XIX.